

Combined, these core academic areas provide students with a powerfully integrated approach to learning that develops and enhances critical thinking and problem solving. Math courses provides students with a structure of concrete facts and skills and then make connections of abstract ideas to the real world. Science lays the groundwork of scientific ideas and principles for the students through their exploration and examination of content and application. Electives provide students with opportunities to explore the world of the arts, foreign language, and technology. With Poway Unified providing the foundation, Black Mountain forges ahead to create a community of learners that continually strive to attain their site mission of developing lifelong, active learners.

THE HUMAN RIGHTS INVESTMENT
ACT—H.R. 5196

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 2000

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing H.R. 5196, the Human Rights Investment Act of 2000. This measure will promote, protect and enhance human rights in United States foreign policy.

This legislation embodies a simple truth: if we really care about human rights, we need to invest in it.

Few issues—if any—receive as much rhetorical support in U.S. foreign policy as human rights. As a nation founded on a profound belief in freedom and individual rights, we focus a great deal of attention in supporting human rights advocates throughout the world.

But we have not matched our rhetoric with resources. We have not sufficiently invested in human rights.

Until recent congressional action forced an increase, the State Department Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights and Labor was by far the smallest “functional” bureau in the Department. It is still one of the very limited bureaus in the entire State Department.

Historically, the human rights bureau received about one-quarter of one percent of all State Department salaries and expenses. It still receives less than half of one percent.

We should put our money where our values are. One penny on the dollar is not too much to ask to support people risking their very lives for human rights.

Likewise, if it is not too much for the American people to ask that, if their tax dollars are paying for weapons sales and military training, then it is equally important that one penny out of every dollar be spent so that we know just what foreign governments are doing with U.S. weapons.

Letting the light shine on how governments are using taxpayer-funded military aid also requires an investment. But the good news is that it is relatively cheap—just one penny out of every dollar of U.S. military aid will do that work.

Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 5196. I submit the full text of H.R. 5196 be printed in the RECORD at this point.

H.R. 5196

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Human Rights Investment Act of 2000”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds the following:

(1) Supporting human rights is in the national interests of the United States and is consistent with American values and beliefs.

(2) Defenders of human rights are changing our world in many ways, including protecting freedom and dignity, religious liberty, the rights of women and children, freedom of the press, the rights of workers, the environment, and the human rights of all persons.

(3) The United States must match its rhetoric on human rights with action and with sufficient resources to provide meaningful support for human rights and for the defenders of human rights.

(4) Congress passed and the President signed into law the International Arms Sales Code of Conduct Act of 1999 (Public Law 106–113; 113 Stat. 1501A–508), which directed the President to seek negotiations on a binding international agreement to limit, restrict, or prohibit arms transfers to countries that do not observe certain fundamental values of human liberty, peace, and international stability, and provided that such an international agreement should include a prohibition on arms sales to countries that engage in gross violations of internationally recognized human rights.

(5) The arms export end-use monitoring systems currently in place should be improved and provided with sufficient funds to accomplish their mission.

SEC. 3. SALARIES AND EXPENSES OF THE BUREAU OF DEMOCRACY, HUMAN RIGHTS, AND LABOR.

For fiscal year 2001 and each fiscal year thereafter, not less than 1 percent of the amounts made available to the Department of State under the heading “Diplomatic and Consular Programs” shall be made available only for salaries and expenses of the Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor, including funding of positions at United States missions abroad that are primarily dedicated to following human rights developments in foreign countries.

SEC. 4. HUMAN RIGHTS AND DEMOCRACY FUND.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF FUND.—There is established a Human Rights and Democracy Fund (hereinafter in this section referred to as the “Fund”) to be administered by the Assistant Secretary for Democracy, Human Rights and Labor.

(b) PURPOSES OF FUND.—The purposes of the Fund are—

- (1) to support defenders of human rights;
- (2) to assist the victims of human rights violations;
- (3) to respond to human rights emergencies;
- (4) to promote and encourage the growth of democracy, including the support for non-governmental organizations in other countries; and
- (5) to carry out such other related activities as are consistent with paragraphs (1) through (4).

(c) FUNDING.—Of the amounts made available to carry out chapter 1 and chapter 10 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, title V of the International Security and Development Cooperation Act of 1980, and section 401 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1969 for each of the fiscal years 2001 and 2002, \$32,000,000 for each such fiscal year shall be made available to the Fund for carrying out the purposes described in subsection (b).

SEC. 5. MONITORING OF UNITED STATES MILITARY ASSISTANCE AND ARMS TRANSFERS.

(a) WEAPONS MONITORING PROGRAM.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT OF PROGRAM.—The Secretary of State shall establish and implement a program to monitor United States military assistance and arms transfers.

(2) RESPONSIBILITY OF ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE FOR DEMOCRACY, HUMAN RIGHTS AND LABOR.—The Assistant Secretary of State for Democracy, Human Rights and Labor shall have primary responsibility for advising the Secretary of State on the establishment and implementation of program described in paragraph (1).

(b) PURPOSES OF PROGRAM.—

(1) PRIMARY PURPOSES.—The primary purposes of the program described in subsection (a) are to ensure to the maximum extent feasible that United States military assistance and weapons manufactured in or sold from the United States are not used—

(A) to commit gross violations of human rights; or

(B) in violation of other United States laws applicable to United States military assistance and arms transfers that are also related to human rights and preventing human rights violations.

(2) OTHER PURPOSES.—The program described in subsection (a) may be used for the following additional purposes:

(A) To prevent violations of other United States laws applicable to United States military assistance and arms transfers.

(B) To prevent fraud and waste by ensuring that tax dollars are not diverted by foreign governments or others from activities in the United States national interest into areas for which the assistance was not and would not have been provided.

(c) ELEMENTS OF THE WEAPONS MONITORING PROGRAM.—The program described in subsection (a) shall ensure to the maximum feasible extent that the United States has the ability—

(1) to determine whether United States military assistance and arms transfers are used to commit gross violations of human rights;

(2) to detect other violations of United States law concerning United States military assistance and arms transfers, including the diversion of such assistance or the use of such assistance by security force or police units credibly implicated in gross human rights violations; and

(3) to determine whether individuals or units that have received United States military security, or police training or have participated or are scheduled to participate in joint exercises with United States forces have been credibly implicated in gross human rights violations.

(d) WEAPONS MONITORING FUND.—

(1) RESERVATION OF FUNDS.—Subject to paragraph (2), for each fiscal year after fiscal year 2000, one percent of the amounts appropriated for each fiscal year for United States military assistance is authorized to be used only to carry out the purposes of this section.

(2) EXCEPTION.—For any fiscal year, if the Secretary of State certifies in writing to the appropriate congressional committees that the United States can carry out the purposes of this section without the full reservation of funds [under paragraph (1)], the Secretary of State shall designate an amount which is not less than one half of one percent of the amounts appropriated for such fiscal year for United States military assistance, and such designated amount is authorized to be used to carry out the purposes of this section.

(3) ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR PROGRAM.—Funds collected from charges under section 21(e) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2761(e)) [and other comparable provisions of law?] may be transferred to the Department of State and made available to carry out the purposes of this section.

(e) **REPORTS.**—The Secretary of State shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees the following reports. To the maximum extent possible, such reports shall be in unclassified form:

(1) Not later than 6 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, and after due consultation with the appropriate congressional committees and others, a plan to implement the provisions of this section.

(2) Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, a report setting forth the steps taken to implement this section and relevant information obtained concerning the use of United States military assistance and arms transfers.

(f) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.**—The term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(A) the Committee on International Relations and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives; and

(B) the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate.

(2) **UNITED STATES MILITARY ASSISTANCE.**—The term “United States military assistance” means—

(A) assistance under chapter 2 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (relating to military assistance), including the transfer of excess defense articles under section 516 of that Act;

(B) assistance under chapter 5 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (relating to international military education and training or “IMET”);

(C) assistance under chapter 8 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (relating to international narcotics control assistance);

(D) assistance under chapter 8 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (relating to antiterrorism assistance);

(E) assistance under section 2011 of title 10, United States Code (relating to training with security forces of friendly foreign countries);

(F) assistance under section 1004 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1991 (relating to additional support for counter-drug activities); and

(G) assistance under section 1033 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (relating to support for counter-drug activities of Peru and Colombia).

(3) **UNITED STATES MILITARY ASSISTANCE AND ARMS TRANSFERS.**—The term “United States military assistance and arms transfers” means—

(A) United States military assistance (as defined in paragraph (2)); or

(B)(i) the transfer of defense articles, defense services, or design and construction services under the Arms Export Control Act, including defense articles or services licensed under section 38 of such Act; and

(ii) any other assistance under the Arms Export Control Act.

SEC. 6. REPORTS ON ACTIONS TAKEN BY THE UNITED STATES TO ENCOURAGE RESPECT FOR HUMAN RIGHTS.

(a) **SECTION 116 REPORT.**—Section 116(d) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2151n(d)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (7), by striking “and” at the end and inserting a semicolon;

(2) in paragraph (8), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(9) for each country with respect to which a determination has been made that extrajudicial killings, torture, or other serious violations of human rights have occurred in the country, the extent to which the United States has taken or will take action to encourage an end to such practices in the country.”.

(b) **SECTION 502B REPORT.**—Section 502B(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2304(b)) is amended by inserting after the 4th sentence the following: “Such report shall also include, for each country with respect to which a determination has been made that extrajudicial killings, torture, or other serious violations of human rights have occurred in the country, the extent to which the United States has taken or will take action to encourage an end to such practices in the country.”.

SEC. 7. AUTHORIZATIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR DEMOCRACY.

There are authorized to be appropriated for the Department of State to carry out the National Endowment for Democracy Act, \$50,000,000 for fiscal year 2001, and \$50,000,000 for fiscal year 2002.

HONORING DONNA FERGANCHICK

HON. SCOTT McINNIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 2000

Mr. McINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this moment to recognize the Honorable Donna Ferganchick of Cedaredge, Colorado. Donna is stepping down as Delta County Commissioner after nearly a decade of public service.

Before moving to the position of Commissioner, Donna served for six years as County Assessor. She served half of her second term, enabling her to be elected the first woman County Commissioner in Delta County history. While Commissioner, Donna has served as Chairman and currently serves as Vice-Chairman of the Board of County Commissioners.

Donna's outstanding leadership abilities have not only benefited Delta County, but also a number of different organizations on which she serves. The Juvenile Diversion Board, the Grand Mesa Scenic By-ways Committee, as well as serving as an Alternative Sentencing Representative, are just a few of the ways in which Donna focuses her energy in order to ensure a better quality of life in Delta County.

Donna, you have served your community, State, and Nation proudly, and I wish you the very best in your future endeavors.

A TRIBUTE TO REIT

HON. PHIL ENGLISH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 2000

Mr. ENGLISH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the real estate investment trust industry on the occasion of its 40th anniversary.

The REIT was created by this very body and signed into law by President Eisenhower on this date in 1960.

A committee report issued that year that through REITs, “small investors can secure advantages normally available only to those with large resources.”

Since then, REITs have lived up to the vision of this institution, making investment in large-scale commercial real estate accessible to people from all walks of life.

Last year, I joined several of my colleagues in co-sponsoring the REIT Modernization Act.

The law, which will take effect in 2001, empowers REITs to offer the same range of services as private competitors in the fast-changing real estate marketplace.

I also want to take this opportunity to commend the industry's trade association, the National Association of Real Estate Investment Trusts, which also came into being four decades ago.

ARAB-ISRAELI PEACE PROCESS

HON. TOM BLILEY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 2000

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, please permit me to share with my colleagues an Op/Ed piece from the Richmond Times Dispatch regarding the Arab-Israeli peace process by Ralph Nurnberger.

[From the Richmond Times-Dispatch, Aug. 13, 2000]

FOR PEACE, ARABS ALSO MUST MAKE CONCESSIONS

(By Ralph Nurnberger)

The collapse of the Camp David summit is a direct result of what could be labeled the “Taba Syndrome.” This is the tendency of Arab leaders to insist that Israel turn over every inch of territory to which the Arabs might be able to make a claim, however nebulous that might be, and regardless of whether these demands ultimately undermine any chance for a peace agreement.

The tactic of holding out for every possible piece of land, which Egypt employed after the first Camp David summit to gain control over a tiny parcel of land called Taba, places “principle above peace,” with the result that often neither is achieved.

Yasser Arafat compounded the difficulties facing the negotiators at Camp David by never wavering from his public statements that he would not settle for anything less than Palestinian control of the West Bank and Gaza together with sovereignty over East Jerusalem. Through his public statements, he established expectations among his constituents that would have led them to accuse him of failure if he came away with only 98 percent of all his demands.

On the other hand, Israeli Prime Minister Ehud Barak informed the Israeli populace that he would be willing to make compromises for peace. The debate on the extent of these compromises led to a number of his coalition partners leaving the government before the Camp David talks even began. This pre-summit debate enabled Barak to be far more forthcoming than Arafat at Camp David. Essentially, the Israelis were prepared to make compromises, however difficult, for peace, while Palestinian leaders had not prepared their people to do the same.

Arab refusal to make peace unless they achieved 100 percent of their demands is not new. Following the first Camp David agreements in 1978, Israel agreed to withdraw from Sinai in exchange for peace with Egypt.

Israel pulled out by 1982, but refused to cede to Egypt a tiny parcel of land along the Gulf of Aqaba called Taba. Taba was a small strip of land along the beach that had no strategic importance, no population, and no natural resources. Its main attraction was a resort hotel and a pretty beach.

Israel claimed sovereignty over Taba, citing a 1906 British map delineating the land to be part of Turkish-controlled Palestine, not British-controlled Egypt. The Egyptians based their claim to Taba on 1917 border demarcations.